

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office action dated March 29, 2005, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed in light of the examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

As a result of the Office action, claims 1, 2, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 1,375,406 to Merrell. Also, claims 1, 2, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 2,552,057 to Paik. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Merrell in view of U.S. 5,791,780 to Bakker, as well as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Paik in view of Bakker. These references have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims and examination and allowance of the newly added claim is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

By the above amendments, claim 1 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter thereof, and new claim 6 has been added to better define the invention over the prior art. No new matter has been added.

According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Moreover, according to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie*

obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

Claim 6 now requires that, first, each of the plurality of the blades being fixed within the corresponding peripheral blade-receiving slit on the disc and, second, each of the plurality of the blades is dimensioned and configured to extend beyond the upper and lower surfaces of the disc in the axial direction, as well as a portion of each blade extending beyond the periphery of the disc. Applicants believe these limitations patentably distinguish claim 6 from the Paik and Merrell prior art references.

Clearly, the blades 7 of Merrell are, first, disposed inwardly or within the circular disc and, second, are dimensioned equally as to the height of the circular disc in the axial direction. Moreover, the blades 9 of the Paik reference are not fixedly attached to the circular disc 8, but rather are pivotally attached thereon having an impeller mechanism 4 and stops 12 to control their pivoting movement. Therefore, in view of foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 6 is patentable over the prior art.

Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter thereof, and claims 3-5 have been amended to correct their dependency and are now dependent from new claim 6, and therefore, are believed to be allowable for the same reason as claim 6.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have

each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claim. It is noted that none of these references have been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated March 29, 2005, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 3-6 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore, Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
DENNISON, SCHULTZ,  
DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD

By: 

Amir H. Behnia  
Reg. No. 50,215  
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 7/29/05